



This material has been provided by Asbury Theological Seminary in good faith of following ethical procedures in its production and end use.

The Copyright law of the united States (title 17, United States code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyright material. Under certain condition specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to finish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be *“used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.”* If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

By using this material, you are consenting to abide by this copyright policy. Any duplication, reproduction, or modification of this material without express written consent from Asbury Theological Seminary and/or the original publisher is prohibited.

Contact

B.L. Fisher Library
Asbury Theological Seminary
204 N. Lexington Ave.
Wilmore, KY 40390

B.L. Fisher Library’s Digital Content
place.asburyseminary.edu



Asbury Theological Seminary
205 North Lexington Avenue
Wilmore, Kentucky 40390

800.2ASBURY
asburyseminary.edu

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE STATE:
A STUDY OF ROMANS 13:1-7

A THESIS
PRESENTED

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENTS
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL STUDIES

BY
ESTHER HOOD
NOVEMBER 1991

THE CHRISTIAN'S RELATIONSHIP TO THE STATE:

A STUDY OF ROMANS 13:1-7

A THESIS

PRESENTED

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENTS
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN BIBLICAL STUDIES

BY

ESTHER HOOD

NOVEMBER 1991

Approved by:

David R. Bauer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1. Introduction1
2. Setting and Structure18
A. Setting19
B. Structure31
3. An Analysis of the Exhortation and Dual Substantiation39
A. The Exhortation39
B. The First Substantiation47
C. The Second Substantiation51
4. The Summary and Implications58
5. Bibliography67

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The following study was made to determine the Biblical concept of a Christian's relationship to the state as found in Romans 13:1-7.

Delimitations

Although this study will touch on the issues of the authenticity of these verses, the origin of these verses, non-Pauline additions, and parallel literature studies, it will not deal with these aspects extensively.

Assumptions

This passage occurs within the letter of Romans in its canonical form. Therefore, the context within which the passage occurs is seen as essential to an accurate interpretation of this passage. "Trajectory criticism" as described by Hultgren is seen as valid in the interpretation of this passage. This term refers to

criticism which "recognizes that while a document or (as in this case) a typical piece of paraenesis (exhortation) may have a background antedating the particular usage under study, it may function and therefore have different meanings in different contexts and movements. One cannot therefore describe the meaning of a passage (in Paul, for example) by looking at its prior meaning (in the pre-Pauline setting)."¹

Importance of the Study

These particular verses bring to mind the dual allegiance of a Christian. The Christian is expected to be obedient to the laws of his or her country while also being obedient to God. At times there develops a tension in the Christian's life due to these dual obligations. An accurate, Biblical understanding of a Christian's

¹ Arland J. Hultgren, "Reflections on Romans 13:1-7: Submission to Governing Authorities," Dialog 15 (Aut 76): 263-4. "The point is made by James M. Robinson, 'Introduction: The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship,' Trajectories Through Early Christianity by J.M. Robinson and Helmut Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp.1-19 (especially p.16)."

relationship to the state is essential for a vital Christian witness to the world. It is the contention of some that these verses have frequently been misinterpreted through the ages. "Perhaps no verses in the New Testament have been more grossly misinterpreted than these, which have often been quoted throughout history to justify injustice, oppression, totalitarianism, despotism, idolatry and even apostasy."² What was Paul's purpose in writing Romans 13:1-7? Did he have a totalitarian state in mind when he dictated these verses? Or did Paul have in mind only a benevolent state? Why did Paul present the state in such a positive light? What is involved in being "subject" to the state? Who are the governing authorities to which a Christian is to be subject? It is to these and other related questions that this paper is addressed.

Review of the Literature³

The most controversial aspect of this passage centers

² James E. Wood Jr. and E. Bruce Thompson and Robert Miller, Church and State in Scripture History and Constitutional Law (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1958), 38.

³ The following review is limited to works written in the twentieth century.

around the meaning of the word, *echousia*.⁴ Most important for a proper understanding, however, is the discussion on the basic theme or themes of this pericope. Receiving minimal attention is the discussion on the authenticity of the passage.

In 1909, Martin Dibelius first argued that *echousia* refers to both earthly and angelic beings. Later he changed his mind, but others then built a case in favor of this position.⁵ The proponents of this view included Oscar Cullmann, Karl Barth, and Clinton Morrison among others. Those in opposition to this view were mainly found among the German scholars and in works not translated into the English language. However, one work by Ernst Kasemann, an opponent to this view, will be cited. Overall, a presentation of the view of these critics by this author necessitates accepting the understanding of the critics

⁴ All Greek words mentioned in this paper are transliterated. The transliterations are according to the standards set forth in the Journal of Biblical Literature.

⁵ C.E.B. Cranfield, A Commentary on Romans 12-13, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, no. 12 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 65. Also on page 65, he cites in his footnote: 'Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert', in S.A.H. 1941-2, 2 Abhandlung (1942), p.7 n.2).

work as presented by others. In the following, much of the critics' view is derived from Morrison's understanding of their position. The following will consist of the view of the proponents for a dual understanding of echousia followed by arguments against such a view by their critics. Next, Morrison's views on the issue will be discussed. Lastly, a brief mention of the "last word" regarding this dialectic will be put forward.

The new understanding of echousia came from an understanding of the spirit world's relationship to the state as found in Paul's writings.⁶ The relationship between the state and angelic beings is said to occur most evidently in 1 Cor 2.6ff, 6.1ff, and Rom 13.1 ff. Concerning echousia in reference to Rom 13:1, Morrison wrote that "in Pauline literature 'authorities' (echousia, including the singular used in such a way as to indicate a plurality, i.e. 'every authority') is consistently used to refer to the spiritual powers."⁷ Another argument to support this view is the "psychological" argument which views the power of the state as that which borders on

⁶ Clinton Morrison, The Powers That Be (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960), 14.

⁷ Ibid. p. 25.

superhuman.⁸ Lastly, the proponents of this position arrived at their stance as a result of their theology. As they see all of history evolving about the Christ event, this passage, too, is viewed as Christological.⁹ A particular aspect of this belief as it had been put forth by Cullmann is that the spiritual powers have a positive role in their relationship to the state as they have been in some way been recommissioned due to the victory of Christ over these beings through His death.¹⁰

Those who opposed the proposed view of *echousia* believe it refers to spiritual powers only in 8 of 99 New Testament occurrences; three times it refers specifically to civil magistrates only.¹¹ They argued that Paul never used *echousia* to indicate a dual reference. In dealing with Rom 13, the term occurs in its plural form only in verse one while occurring in its singular form twice in the remainder of the passage from which it receives its meaning. Also, *archontes* is used synonymously with

⁸ Morrison, p. 28, cites E. Peterson, 'Das Problem des Nationalismus im alten Christendom', TZ 7, 1941, pp. 81ff.

⁹ Morrison, op. cit., p. 28.

¹⁰ Oscar Cullmann, The State in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), 68-69.

¹¹ Morrison, op. cit., p. 42.

echousia indicating human beings and no other modification occurs to indicate otherwise.¹² They also felt there is no basis for believing that there is now a "positive place for the powers in the kingdom of Christ "¹³ as Barth and Cullmann would believe. The idea of the pagan leaders being servants of God is common in Old Testament thought so that this positive role is nothing new. They contended that even from creation the powers could do nothing but Christ's will anyway.¹⁴ As far as the text being Christological, the critics stated that since the name of Christ does not appear in this passage, it is not Christological. Next, the new understanding of echousia would indicate that Paul calls the people to be subject to human authorities with spiritual beings operating in a position of authority above them while these spiritual beings are more or less subject to Christ.¹⁵ This would not build a foundation upon which the Christians could then be subject. Lastly, the argument on dogmatic grounds relates that the teaching on the state is based on God the Father and not God the Son.¹⁶

The previous dialog between the proponents and the

¹² Ibid., p. 43.

¹³ Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 45.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁶ Loc. cit.

critics of the new exegesis of Romans 13:1 occurred in the 1940's and 1950's. Clinton Morrison in his book The Powers That Be, published in 1960, argued for the dual reference but for other reasons. Basically he dealt with two aspects of the issue both related to the idea of communication. He argued that there were concepts accepted by the writer and the readers of Romans that were not elaborated because they were a part of the basic understanding of either the people in the Graeco-Roman world or of the Christian community.¹⁷ He understood the word *echousia* as indicating the state officials with spiritual beings behind them as he goes to great lengths to show that this was the basic world view of the common person in Graeco-Roman times. This relationship was not disputed in the early Christian community. Beyond his acceptance of this view of the authorities, Morrison relates a Christological understanding of this passage as he stated "the cosmic scope of the work of Christ in early Christian thought and the cosmic context of the State in contemporary thought forbid us any longer to ignore the significance of the Christian faith for a proper interpretation of the communication in Romans 13.1-7."¹⁸ Contrary to Cullmann, Morrison stated that the redemptive

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 103.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 103.

work of Christ did not change the character of the authorities nor their effect on the world. It was not "the spirits who were affected, but the believers."¹⁹ The believers are now liberated from the powers.²⁰ A person who is "in Christ" finds his security in Christ and is no longer subject to other world forces which might cause him to fear. Morrison understood the subjection which Paul calls for as a Christian's "conscious relationship to governing authorities as a man in Christ."²¹ This subjection serves Christ's purpose of furthering the gospel in the world as Christians look forward to the eschaton.²²

Cranfield, writing in 1965, reported that the debate had reached a "stalemate."²³ However, Ernst Kasemann in his book New Testament Questions of Today of which the second edition was published in 1965 was of a differing opinion. In his view the concept of a dual meaning for *echousia* was the same as the doctrine of the angels of the nations. Although Kasemann agreed that the early Christian hymns spoke of Christ's lordship over the cosmic powers

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 116.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 119.

²¹ Ibid., p. 123.

²² Ibid., p. 125.

²³ Cranfield, op. cit. p. 68.

which had been subjected to him, he refuted the view that Paul therefore knew his readership understood *echousia* to have a dual reference. He attributed these hymns to the "enthusiastic religious life of the community" and believed that these hymns were derived from "the myth of the world savior familiar to us from Vergil's Fourth Eclogue." In addition Paul had to discount enthusiasm throughout his life.²⁴ In his opinion on the whole controversy "the exegetical battle in this matter came to a decisive end when A. Strobel, in his article on Rom. 13, showed conclusively that the Jewish doctrine of angels of the nations is not to be imported into our text and that, all along the line, the terminology we encounter here has its origin in the vocabulary of secular government in the Hellenistic world."²⁵

In the previous discussion the lines were fairly well drawn between the two camps. Either one believed *echousia* stood for the earthly rulers or they believed that a dual meaning was intended. The views are much more varied concerning the theme or themes of the passage. Some

²⁴ Ernst Käsemann, New Testament Questions of Today, trans. by W.J. Montague (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 206.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 204. Käsemann cites Strobel in 'Zum Verständnis vom Rom, 13', ZNW 47, 1956, pp.67-93.

understand this passage to be concerned with a theory of the state while others understand it to discuss a Christian's relationship to the state. Others, mainly with a view of the context within which the passage occurs, saw a concern for the eschaton, for Christology, and/or for Christian love.

Bishop Gore writing in the earliest part of the century spoke of this passage as representing the ideal State.²⁶ C. H. Dodd in the early 1930's thought of this passage as "Paul's theory of civil government."²⁷ He wrote that the surrounding material, Romans 12 and Romans 13:8-10 is dealing with higher Christian principles while Romans 13:1-7 speaks of the moral order that God has established throughout the government. So Dodd referred to two orders -- one a "natural moral order" and the other an "order of grace."²⁸ In a later writing dated in the 1950's, Dodd, however, understood Paul to be addressing the question of

²⁶ James L. Garrett, "Dialectic of Roman 13:1-7 and Revelation 13: Part One," [editorial] Journal of Church and State 18 (Aut 76): 433.

²⁷ Hultgren, op.cit., p. 264. referred to Dodd's earlier work.

²⁸ C.H. Dodd, Romans, The Moffat New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1932), 204.

the attitude that a Christian should have toward the Roman Empire. But rather than emphasizing the admonition to be subject, he continued to speak of "wrath" as being the "key-word of the passage" and to speak of a moral order versus a Christian order.²⁹ Barth referred to an order in society created by God so that people may live in society with each other. He spoke of Christian subjection to the state which is ordained by God. This subjection may vary as the (existing) state deviates from the concept of the (true) state.³⁰ The respect owed to the state may include criticism which should be given at all times.³¹ Nygren also put the emphasis on the state when he stated that Paul "is setting forth the basic Christian view about worldly government" and when he stressed that this is an "aeon of wrath" within which an earthly ruler serves God.³² Stringfellow believes that it is the vocation of the state

²⁹ C.H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffat New Testament Commentary (London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1959), 211.

³⁰ Karl Barth, Church and State, trans. by G.Ronald Howe (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1939), 69.

³¹ Ibid., p. 139.

³² Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans. Trans. by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), 429.

that is being discussed here as he sees the state following its vocation in this Romans passage while that vocation is distorted in Revelation 13.³³ Many interpreters understand this passage as giving a Christian attitude and conduct toward the state. The emphasis is therefore on the Christian who receives the exhortation rather than primarily on the state. Käsemann similarly stated that the order of creation is not the main emphasis, but the admonition is.³⁴ Hultgren agreed that much has been made of Romans 13:1b-4 and not of 13:1a, the admonition, and 13:5, its restatement.³⁵ Dyck understood Paul to be discouraging anarchy but Paul does so via his overarching theme of "love of neighbor" of which this pericope is a

³³ William Stringfellow, Conscience and Obedience (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1977), 35.

³⁴ Käsemann, op. cit., p. 355.

³⁵ Hultgren, op. cit., p. 267. Also in agreement that Christian conduct in relation to the authorities is the basic issue are Paul Lehmann, The Transfiguration of Politics (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), 37, J.I.H. McDonald, "Romans 13, 1-7 and Christian Social Ethics Today," Modern Churchman 29,2 (1987): 21, and George L. Carey, "Biblical-Theological Perspectives on War and Peace," The Evangelical Quarterly 57 (April 1985): 168-9.

part.³⁶ Eller also saw love as a major theme.³⁷ Bornkamm understood Paul to be admonishing Christians to do their duty as citizens so that they may tend to the more important duty of love.³⁸ Yoder saw suffering along with love as a vital concept with which to interpret Romans 13:1-7.³⁹

Dealing with the surrounding material has caused some interpreters to note an eschatological and / or Christological concern in this passage. Stringfellow said this passage "bears an explicit eschatological context"⁴⁰ and stated that the readers learn that "God's sovereignty is vindicated."⁴¹ Some saw Rom 13:11-14 as evidence of an

³⁶ Harold J. Dyck, "The Christian and the Authorities in Romans 13: 1-7," Direction 14 No 1 (Spring 1985): 45 and 48.

³⁷ Vernard Eller, "Romans 13 (actually Romans 12:14-13:8) Reexamined," Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin 10 (Ja-F 1987) 7.

³⁸ Günther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. by D.M.G. Stalker, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971), 215.

³⁹ John Howard Yoder, The Christian Witness to the State, Institute of Mennonite Studies Series, no. 3 (Newton, Kansas: Faith and Life Press, 1964), 197.

⁴⁰ Stringfellow, op. cit., p. 15.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 92-93.

eschatalogical hope which is primary to understanding this unit and the call to submission.⁴² Another saw the use of the term "wrath" as used in 13:6 as well as in 3:5 and 4:15. as eschatalogical.⁴³ Besides discouraging anarchy and noting the theme of love, Dyck stated that there is in this passage a "hope (that is) quite the opposite of the hope that underlies rebellion."⁴⁴ Cranfield among others saw Christology as a vital aspect of this passage.⁴⁵ Cranfield agreed with Morrison that though the passage does not mention Christ, readers would have understood that

⁴² Yoder, op. cit., p. 198.

Cullmann, op. cit., p. 98-99.

⁴³ Alexander F. C. Webster, "St. Paul's Political Advice to the Haughty Christians in Rome: an Exegesis of Romans 13:1-7," Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly, 25 No 4 (1981): 267.

⁴⁴ Dyck, op. cit., p. 48.

⁴⁵ Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, vol. 31 of International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975): 653.

Cullmann, op. cit., p. 101ff.

Morrison, op. cit., p. 112.

Marcus Borg, "A New Context for Romans XIII," New Testament Studies 19 (Oct 1972-73): 215.

Christology is "the central point from which Paul comprehended the whole of God's revealed plan."⁴⁶ Kasemann disagreed stating that there is neither an eschatological nor a Christological concern. Rather he feels this is a rare instance of Paul's in which he refers to the "will of the creator."⁴⁷

Another area of utmost importance but of little controversy is the authenticity of the passage. Most have agreed that these verses are authentic.⁴⁸ Kallas saw Romans 13:1-7 as an interpolation hinting that it was the church that added these verses during the period of Nero's persecutions.⁴⁹ O'Neill believed that these verses should

⁴⁶ Cranfield, loc. cit.

Morrison, loc. cit.

⁴⁷ Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980), 351.

⁴⁸ J.I.H. McDonald, "Romans 13.1-7: A Test Case for New Testament Interpretation," New Testament Studies 35 (1989) 540 -41, listed among the dissenters Ernst Barnikol, James Kallas, John O'Neill, and Winsome Munro.

⁴⁹ James Kallas, "Romans XIII. 1-7: An Interpolation," New Testament Studies 11 (Oct 64 - July 65): 367-8.

not have been permitted in the canon.⁵⁰

One objection of James Kallas is the apparent disconnection of thought between the passage and its surrounding context.⁵¹ This is thought to be due to Paul's use of catechetical material⁵² which originated among Hellenistic Jews.⁵³ Tripp sees mainly the influence of sapiential tradition in Romans 13:1-7 which is interwoven through with apocalyptic material forming an organic composition.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ John Cochrane O'Neill, Paul's Letter to the Romans, (Baltimore, Penguin Books Inc., 1975), 209.

⁵¹ Kallas, op. cit., p. 367-68.

⁵² Webster, op. cit., p. 273-4.

N.A. Dahl, "Is There a New Testament Basis for the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms?" Lutheran World 12 no. 4 (1965): 344.

⁵³ Webster, op. cit. p. 275.

Wayne A. Meeks, The First Urban Christians (Binghamton, New York: Yale University Press, 1983), p. 106.

⁵⁴ See the dissertation by David Tripp, An Interpretation on Rom 13:1-7 in Light of Sapiential and Apocalyptic Tradition (Southwest Baptist Theological Seminary), 1987), 213 pp.

Although Käsemann understood this to be a "self-contained passage,"⁵⁵ he believed that the passage is authentic.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Käsemann, New Testament, p. 199.

⁵⁶ Käsemann, Commentary, p. 351.

CHAPTER 2

Setting and Structure

The message of Romans 13:1-7 can only be rightly understood as one tries to perceive what Paul sought to communicate to the Roman church. Paul's communication to them was for their benefit. He would have been sure to take into consideration who they were, where they were, and what their particular circumstances were. His utmost concern was their relationship to Christ. On their part, the readers of his epistle evidently knew something about the author. Also, prior to reading the exhortation found in Romans 13, Paul had related much information to them about what it means to be a Christian through chapters 1 through 13. It is the purpose of this chapter to explore the setting of this communication as well as the context in which it occurs and the structure of the passage itself.

Setting

Paul, the author of this letter was both a Christian and a Jew as well as a leader and a servant; he had an allegiance to God as a Christian and to Rome as a Roman citizen. Throughout the Roman empire Paul was able to preach the gospel, set up churches, and communicate freely with them. He had had many favorable experiences with the Roman system as he was able to appeal to Roman law and his rights as a Roman citizen. The military quelled the mob that had attacked Paul (Acts 21:27-33). Paul used his rights as a Roman citizen to appeal to Caesar (Acts 25:10-12). Yet Paul was aware that it was under the Roman authority that Jesus was crucified.

The dates given for the writing of this epistle vary within about four years. It is known that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome in A.D. 49. Acts 18:2 mentions Aquila and Priscilla who had recently been expelled from Rome by the order of Claudius and went to Corinth where they met Paul.⁵⁷ Acts 18:11 indicates he taught there for a year and a half. The end of that period would be the middle of

⁵⁷ The book of Acts is used in determining the date of writing and the setting of Romans. This assumes the accuracy of the chronology of those events according to the modern understanding.

50 at the earliest to the middle of 51 at the latest. Paul was then brought before Gallio. Gallio was proconsul of that region from the spring of 51 to the spring of 52.⁵⁸ So it can be seen that Paul was before Gallio in the spring to the summer of 51. This was at the end of Paul's second missionary journey. During the third missionary journey he spent two years and three months at Ephesus according to Acts 19:8,10. It is after this for reasons that will be explained that Paul was believed to have written Romans. The above times along with those lesser periods of times unaccounted for easily place the date of the earliest writing in 54. For the later date, one considers that the persecutions of Christians under Nero began in 64. Paul had at least two years of limited freedom in which he could teach and preach. (Acts 28:30) Prior to this and after his arrest in Jerusalem he was in prison in Caesarea for two years. (Acts 24:27) On his way to Rome, the winter was spent on the island of Malta. (Rom 28:11) This brings the date of the latest possible time of composition of Romans to 59 A.D.

Concerning the location of the writing of Romans, in Rom 15:19 Paul proclaimed that "from Jerusalem and as far around as Illyricum I have fully proclaimed the good news

⁵⁸ Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), 9.

of Christ."⁵⁹ And so he is writing at a time after he had finished his missionary journeys. (Rom 15:23-24) Also in Romans 15:25-26 he indicated that he was about to go to Jerusalem taking with him resources that he had collected in Macedonia and Achaia. Acts 20:1-3 indicates he had already spent time with believers and was ready to go to Syria, but had to return via Macedonia because of a plot against him. It is noted that he spent three months in Greece. The remainder of the third missionary journey, Paul travelled and was quite eager to get to Jerusalem. So the evidence supports the contention that Paul wrote Romans in Achaia. Most likely he was at Corinth or Cenchreae, the harbor of Corinth. Additional evidence to support this is that the carrier of the letter was Phoebe who was from Cenchreae as noted in Rom 16:1. It is possible also that Gaius who was Paul's host according to Romans 16:23 may be the same Gaius that Paul baptized in Corinth as noted in 1Cor 1:14. Erastus mentioned in Romans 16:23 may also have been the one mentioned in 2 Tim 4:20 who is said to have remained in Corinth.

An obvious observation which should nonetheless be made in regard to this church-state issue is the fact that this letter was sent to the capital of the Roman Empire.

⁵⁹ The New Revised Standard Version of the Bible is used.

Most likely because of this fact the Roman Christians had a broader scope of influence. Paul wrote that their "faith is proclaimed throughout the world." (Rom 1:8) This is not said of any of the other churches to which Paul had written.

That Paul had not met them is evident from Rom 1:10 and 1:13 in which he states that he hoped finally to come to them, but had been hindered thus far. He expressed the same thing in Rom 15:22.

It is believed that the Roman church began with the conversion of Jews to Christianity who later converted Gentiles to the faith. The second chapter of Acts provides a possible clue to the origin of the church. Here it is reported that there were visitors from Rome who believed and were baptized. They were among those who devoted themselves to teaching, fellowship, the breaking of bread and prayer. The sixteenth chapter of Romans lists the names of many persons with whom Paul had previously met and with whom he was acquainted who may have been instrumental in beginning or building up the church in Rome. That the church was not founded by other apostles is evident from Rom 1:14-15 as Paul spoke of his obligation to preach the gospel to them in Rome along with Rom 15:20 wherein Paul stated that it is his ambition not to preach where Christ has already been preached.

Dodd believed there were more Jewish Christians.⁶⁰ Others believe the church consisted of mainly Gentile believers.⁶¹ It is quite evident from the letter to the Romans that both were present. There are references to the prophets and the holy scriptures as well as to Jesus' being a descendent of David which would indicate a Jewish readership. (Rom 1:2-3) Paul spoke of Abraham their forefather according to the flesh. (Rom 4:1) On the other hand there are references to the Gentiles in Rom 1:13 where he expressed an interest in reaping "some harvest among you as I have among the rest of the Gentiles," and in Rom 4:16-17 where Abraham is called "the father of us all, as it is written, 'I have made you the father of many nations'." More directly Paul stated in chapter eleven, "now I am speaking to you Gentiles." (Rom 11:13)

Concerning Paul's purpose or purposes in writing to the Romans, Paul expressly wrote that he planned to stop to see

⁶⁰ C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n.d.), xxviii.

⁶¹ Bornkamm, op. cit. p. 213.

Robert Duncan Culver, Toward a Biblical View of Civil Government, (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1974), p. 248.

Webster, op. cit. p. 280.

them on his way to Spain. (Rom 15:24,28) Primarily, though Paul spoke of why he was coming to visit them. He did not explicitly relate his reasons for going into great detail about the Christian faith. Romans 1:13 speaks of Paul reaping "some harvest among (them)" as he saw his purpose of preaching the gospel in Rome. (Rom 1:15) Paul also stated that he would like to impart a spiritual gift to them. (Rom 1:11) Beyond this, he spoke of the obedience which comes by faith which he hoped to bring about among all the nations. (Rom 1:5) This same idea is reiterated in the next to the last verse of the last chapter which serves to emphasize this concept. Yet the crux of this polemic found in Romans chapter one through eight is that man is justified by his faith. Paul does not clearly state why he wrote Romans. It can only be deduced that he saw a need to clarify the basis on which one is righteous before God.

The situation in the Roman church is somewhat obscure. Unlike other churches to which he had written, Paul did not have first-hand knowledge of this community of believers. The major portions of this letter do not address specific situations as one can find in Paul's other letters. Paul briefly spoke against unbecoming behavior in Rom 13:13. He also showed a concern for those who are weaker in their faith. (Rom 14 and 15:1-13) And Rom 16:17-20 does address a problem of dissension in the church, but this is a short, general passage. In regard to the passage at hand one may

ask if there is any indication that the Roman Christians suffered persecution from the authorities. That this is so is not apparent from the passage or the context. There is some evidence that the church did experience suffering as noted in Rom 5:3 "we also boast in our sufferings. . . ." and Rom 8:18 "I consider that the sufferings of this present time. . . ." Also Paul spoke of tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, and the sword which cannot separate them from Christ's love. He also said that they were being killed for Christ's sake, including the readers as if they, too, experienced those things.(Rom 8:35-36) There is no indication from whom these trials come.

There were "perhaps a few hundred" Christians living in the Rome while there were approximately 50,000 Jews.⁶² The number of Christians to Jews was so small that the Christians could possibly have been seen as a Jewish sect in the eyes of an outsider. Also the Christians would have a relatively small voice in political matters.

This small Roman church is believed to have been influenced by the Jewish nationalism that ran high during

⁶² Borg, op. cit. p. 212. See footnote no. 4.

that period of history.⁶³ Jews throughout the empire had suffered under the policies of the last three emperors:

⁶³ Carey, op. cit. p. 168.

Also, Borg believed that Roman Jewish Christians stayed in contact with Palestinian Jews and shared similar negative experiences and feelings toward Rome. Among other reasons for believing that they stayed in touch with the Palestinian Jews were the common sentiment toward Jerusalem, the city most associated with their faith. Also, many Roman Jews or their forefathers had been taken captive by Romans in previous military expeditions. There were also frequent trips to Rome from Palestine. (Borg, op. cit. p. 208-9 quotes many "ancient" sources.)

During one of these trips, Palestinian Jews requested that Jerusalem no longer be under the rule of the Herods. Also, many Jews in Rome joined Jews throughout the empire to support the cause of the Palestinian Jews. (Borg, op. cit. p. 209-11.)

Other specific incidents mentioned by Borg which occurred during the reign of Claudius include the slaughter of about 30,000 Jews during Passover. This time was also marked by the destruction of a copy of the Torah by a soldier. (Borg, op. cit. p. 211.)

This was believed to have occurred near to the time of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome.

Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius.⁶⁴ It is known that the Jews were expelled from Rome in 49 A.D. Seutonius reports on this expulsion that: "Since the Jews constantly made disturbances at the instigation of Chrestus, he [Claudius] expelled them from Rome."⁶⁵ This is commonly interpreted

⁶⁴ Borg, op. cit. p. 210-11.

Also, concerning Gaius Caligula, Josephus reports that about A.D. 39 or 40 he tried to have a statue of himself placed in the temple in Jerusalem. (Wood, Thompson, and Miller, op. cit. p. 43. See footnote no. 35.)

Caius Caesar's subjects erected altars and temples to him and treated him as a god. The Jews, however, pleaded with the head of the Roman army that was dispatched to Galilee to erect a statue in the temple. The Jews were ready to sacrifice their own lives rather than have a statue of Caius erected. (Antiquities viii, 135, 144-5. Wars of the Jews II, 572, 574) At the time of Paul's writing Nero had not yet begun to persecute Christians. However, "Nero had usurped the throne from its rightful heir, Britannicus, whom he then had murdered. Here was a tyrannical ruler and government" (John A. Witmer, review of When is it Right to Fight?, by Robert A. Morey. Bibliotheca Sacra (April-June 1987): 228.)

⁶⁵Borg, op. cit. p. 211-12 cites Suetonius, Claudius xxv. 4.

as difficulties which arose among the Jews over preaching about Christ.⁶⁶ It is quite possible that the Christians were also expelled at that time. It may be that there were expelled because of disturbances over the preaching of Christ. Or it may be that the authorities did not see a distinction between Christian Jews and Jews that did not profess Christ.

Concerning some of the sociological information available Holmberg writes, "The New Testament data we have on which to apply sociological interpretations are themselves interpretations, not hard (precise, measurable) data, which could be assembled again or verified through other sources or procedures."⁶⁷ Still some authors venture to comment on the sociological situation of the early Christians.

⁶⁶ Borg disagrees and quotes Lapiana in support of the view that there was a conflict in the Jewish hope of a "Messianic kingdom" over against the Roman hope for the eternal existence of the empire: "'Here were two programs of universal expansion incompatible the one with the other'." (Borg, op. cit. p. 212 quotes LaPiana, p. 384 -- The reference was not given.)

⁶⁷ Bengt Holmberg, Sociology and the New Testament, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990), 10.

It is believed that being without citizenship was a humiliating situation for the Jews.⁶⁸

Since many of the Jews were descendants of those who had been forcibly taken to Rome, it would seem highly probable that on the whole, the Jews were of a low social standing and were lacking in citizenship. Yet there were Christians in Caesar's household either at that time or not

⁶⁸ Culver, op. cit., pp. 259-60 quotes E.A. Judge, The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century, (London: Tyndale, 1960), 28 who stated that the:

'lack of citizenship was a humiliating barrier to social acceptance in many cases. The New Testament writers frequently reflect the feelings of the disqualified in their metaphors for the ideal moral alienation from the world. The familiar group of terms: "strangers," "foreigners," "aliens," "pilgrims," "sojourners," (e.g., Eph. 2:19; Heb. 11:13, 1 Pet. 1:1; 17; 2:11) are all drawn from the technical vocabulary of republican exclusiveness. Addressed to persons who were undoubtedly often under civil disabilities in their own communities, they must have added peculiar points to the demand for moral detachment.'

too many years after the writing of Romans. (Philippians 4:22) Although those of the Christian faith were separated from others by their faith, "the Pauline sectarian communities were remarkable open to outsiders, more conscious of the need to make a good impression on them, and more willing to consort with them in ordinary social intercourse than sects usually are. . . ."⁶⁹ The relationships between Jews and Jewish Christians continued due to the fact that they were relatives or friends or had other social ties.

As the letter to the Romans was most likely written between A.D. 54 and A. D. 59 and the persecutions under Nero began in A. D. 64, there is no direct evidence to suggest that Paul or his readers had at the time of this writing suffered because of the present government. Rather Paul benefited from the system of the Roman government. Of all the cities at which he had previously preached, Corinth was geographically the closest to Rome. It is interesting to note that this was the place to which Aquila and Priscilla went after their expulsion from Rome. Most likely it was in Corinth that Paul wrote. The most up-to-date information concerning the Roman Christians would more likely be available here than any other city to

⁶⁹ Holmberg, op. cit. p. 95-6.

which Paul had come. The church had not been founded by Paul or any of the apostles yet their faith was known throughout the world as they resided in the capital of the "world." Their membership consisted of Jews and Gentiles. Although it is clear that at the time of this writing Paul intended to stop and preach there prior to going on to Spain, it is unclear why Paul sets forth this polemic on justification by faith. Little evidence is given that explains the situation of the Roman church. Extra-biblical evidence shows that the Christians were few in number as compared to the thousands of Jews with little potential to be of any influence politically. It is believed that the feelings of Jewish nationalism affected this small church with its members of Jewish heritage.

Structure

How does Romans 13:1-7 and the division to which it belongs fit into the whole of the book? Romans 1:18-15:13 seems to constitute the body of the letter while Rom 1:1-17 serves as an introduction and Rom 15:14-16:27 concludes with mention of Paul's work, commendations, and a blessing. The body of the letter consists of the doctrine of faith found in Romans 1:18 to 8:39, the question of the promise

of God to Israel in 9:1-11:36⁷⁰ and the practice of faith found in 12:1-15:13. And so the pericope of which this paper is concerned is found in the subdivision on the practice of faith. It seems that to understand the practice of faith one must come to grips with Paul's line of argument found in the first sub-section, the doctrine of faith.

Briefly, Paul presents the problem in 1:18-3:20 as he shows that none is justified by the law since all have sinned. In 3:21-4:25, using the example of Abraham, Paul proves that justification, or righteousness before God, comes by faith and not by the law. In 5:1-8:39 one sees that justification through Christ results in peace with God, the hope of glory, and the indwelling of the Spirit. The concluding chapters of this subsection, 9:1-11:36, explain that even in the case of Israel, God had planned that a person was to be justified by faith in Christ.⁷¹ It may have appeared that God's promises to Israel had failed. But those who are the true children of Abraham are those who believe God's promise and not necessarily those who are his fleshly descendents. (9:8) Seeking to be righteous by

⁷⁰ Anders Nygren, Commentary on Romans, trans. by Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), 35-36.

⁷¹ Nygren, loc. cit.

the law, Israel rejected righteousness by faith. (10:3-4)
Israel will be saved, but not at this time which God
extends his mercy to the Gentiles. (Rom 11:25)

Now a closer examination of how the segment of Romans 12-13 fits into the whole of the book is in order. This is necessary to see more clearly its function and therefore how Romans 13:1-7 fits within the whole. The word "law" occurs 69 times in the book of Romans, most frequently in chapter seven. And that there is a concern of obedience is also seen in the first and last lines of Paul's letter as a whole. In Rom 1:5 he speaks of "the obedience of faith among all the nations for the sake of his name." And in 16:26 Paul speaks of the gospel which "is made known to all nations. . . . to bring about the obedience of faith." This obedience, however, is only possible as a result of faith. All persons were once under the power of sin. (3:9) But, righteousness is "reckoned to us who believe in him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was handed over to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification." (4:24-25) And those who have become so justified in Christ Jesus are no longer under the power of sin (6:5-6) and are rather free to become "slaves of righteousness." (6:18) Chapter eight goes on to speak of the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (8:2) by which "the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to

the Spirit." (8:4) Romans 12:1-2 is a general statement which is particularized in the remainder of chapter 12 and into chapter thirteen. This teaching on life in the Spirit appears again in the admonition of Paul in Romans 12:2: "Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your minds, so that you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect." This proving the will of God as noted before is particularized in 12:3 to 13:7. In 13:8-10 there is a concern for the fulfilling of the law. This emphasis on conduct as a result of the life in Christ is summarized as noted in 13:13-14 "let us live honorably put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh. . . . "

The previous paragraphs may seem to be a bit of a digression. Yet Paul had a concern that the Roman Christians live in the Spirit of Christ. He appealed to them to allow their minds to be transformed. It is in this context that we find Rom 13:1-7 and of which this passage has been placed as an integral part of the whole. More precisely, though, how does 13:1-7 fit in the segment of Romans 12-13? This segment deals with conduct -- conduct which is a consequence of a transformed mind which is motivated by God's mercy. In 12:3-13 Paul spoke of one's relationships within the body of Christ. Rom 12:14-21 deals with one's relationships with those they consider

their "enemies." In Rom 13:1-7 Paul spoke of one's relationships with the "governing authorities." And so we see how this material is arranged by particularization.

For the structure of Romans 13:1-7 the work of Robert H. Stein as found in his article, "The Argument of Romans 13:1-7" will be followed rather closely.⁷²

There are five major structural aspects of this passage. Verse one begins with a general statement that is an exhortation. This is followed by a two-fold substantiation of why one is to be subject. The third aspect is a summary of the substantiation which forms a chiasm with verse five. The next aspect is a substantiation of the summary from practical experience. The last part is a specific command which particularizes the subjection explaining how one is to be subject.

"Let every person be subject to the governing authorities" (13:1) as the general statement is self-explanatory noting the content of the remainder of the passage. The substantiation for the general statement is two-fold expressing the source and the purpose of the authorities: "for there is no authority except from God" and, in verse three, "for rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad." The first reason is further

⁷² Robert H. Stein, "The Argument of Romans 13:1-7," Novum Testamentum, 31, 4 (1989): 325-343.

specified "those authorities that exist have been instituted by God" which would bring the present Roman governing authorities to mind for the reader. And so a logical consequence of resisting authorities is to resist "what God has appointed" The result of resisting is, as the last phrase in verse two states, judgment. As Stein points out judgment by God is an assumption of Paul,⁷³ it is something that he assumes the reader takes for granted. This brings us to the next reason for one to be subject to the governing authorities which is: "for rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. . . ." The preposition "for " which begins this statement indicates that what follows provides the basis for that which precedes it. Stein argues convincingly that this is a substantiation for the general statement. His most convincing arguments are that this switch to a discussion of "good conduct" does not flow easily from the previous phrases which speak of one resisting authorities and this positive role of the government also does not follow well these same verses which speak of judgment. Another convincing argument which Stein puts forth is that "Paul in 13:5 grounds his summary appeal to be subject to the authorities on these two reasons. This two-fold appeal to wrath and conscience is best understood as corresponding in

⁷³ Ibid., p. 330.

some way to a two-fold appeal in the preceding material."⁷⁴

The remainder of verse 3 and verse four substantiate 3a by contrast just as the latter part of 3a is structured by contrast "good conduct, but to bad." They explain why rulers are not a terror to good conduct. Verse 3b would then be like a protasis "if you would have no fear of the authority" with an exhortation and the result being "then do what is good and you will receive its approval." This is substantiated by 4a, "for it is God's servant for your good." By contrast, the protasis of the "negative" substantiation is "but if you do wrong" with the apodosis also having an exhortation and result which is "be afraid, for the authority does not bear the sword in vain" which is further substantiated by "it is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer."

This brings us to the fifth aspect of this passage, the summary of verse five. Here the admonition of verse one is repeated. Avoiding God's wrath coincides with the second reason one is to be subject: that is, conducting oneself well results in avoiding wrath meted out by God's servants, the rulers. "Because of conscience" coincides with the first reason to be subject; that is, the knowledge that the authority of the rulers is from God. And so there is a chiasm with verse 1b-2=A, verse 3-4=B, wrath=a, and

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 333.

conscience =b. This idea will be explained and expounded in the next chapter.

This next aspect is a substantiation of all that precedes as Paul appealed to what the Roman Christians already do as a matter of practice.

Lastly, there is a particularized summary in verse seven explaining how one is to be subject.

Further analysis of these main aspects of this passage follows in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

An Analysis of the Exhortation and Dual Substantiation

This chapter will be concerned with a further analysis of the exhortation and the dual substantiation. The chiasmic summary, the substantiation from practical experience, and the particularized summary as well as the context of this passage within its segment and the book as a whole will be brought forward at times to determine the meaning of these particular clauses. This is done to clarify the Christian's relationship to the state as Paul determined it to be at the time of the writing of this letter.

"Let every person be subject to the governing authorities;"

According to the structure of the passage, this clause contains the main emphasis of the passage. This exhortation to subjection has a dual substantiation explaining the source and the purpose of the authorities. Paul's concern was to teach about one's relationship to authorities, and not primarily to teach about the

authorities.

Considering the immediate context, one is reminded that this subjection is a part of the call to the renewal of the Christian's mind. This was apparently a new way of thinking for the Roman Christians. The fact that he must command subjection indicates that there was a lack of subjection by the Roman Christians. Eller sees the authorities as the ones which the Roman Christians would be least able to love. It would be a natural tendency to hate or resist them.⁷⁵ This subjection calls them to a "supernatural" mind-set spoken of in 12:2.

Within the segment one sees that Paul had made a gradual transition from that which was easier to that which was most difficult for the Roman Christians. He had moved from speaking of relationships with those within the church to people outside the church (most notably those who would be considered their enemies) to those who represent the Roman Empire. At the same time he moved from a way of thinking about oneself and others and what one does to speaking about love in relationships. These can be seen in the following clauses and sentences: "I say to everyone among you not to think of yourself more highly than you

⁷⁵ Vernard Eller, "Romans 13 (actually Romans 12:14-13:1-8) Reexamined," Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin 10 (Ja-F 1987) 7.

ought to think" (12:3--church/humility), "love one another with mutual affection" (12:10--church/love), "live in harmony with one another; do not be haughty" (12:16--others/humility), "be subject to the governing authorities" (13:1--state/subjection), and "love your neighbor as yourself." (13:10--others in general/love)

This transition serves to make the admonition of 13:1 easier to accept as it is seen in the light of the whole train of Paul's thought. That is, this segment is geared to helping the Christians achieve right relationships in all areas of their lives. In the previous paragraph five of the eight verses refer to enemies or evil which may suggest that the Roman authorities were seen as enemies or as those who did evil.

It is significant that Paul specifically singled out the individual. The term "every" occurs only one other time in this segment in reference to the individual. Paul addressed the Roman Christians in the beginning of the particularization of 12:3-13:7 as "everyone among you." (Rom. 12:3) Here Paul told the Roman Christian to change the way they thought about themselves in relation to others in the church. Similarly Paul stressed that this message was for the individual and here Paul commanded a change of attitude to one of subjection. *Pasa psyche* may be a

"Hebraism" which refers to one's "individual duty."⁷⁶ This may suggest that while some were already obeying this command, others among them were not. And so Paul commanded subjection.

The extent of that subjection needs to be explored. Concerning the term *hypotassestho*, the vast majority of exegetes state that this does not mean absolute obedience. The most often cited Biblical verse to support this is Acts 5:29, "we must obey God rather than any human authority." Kasemann notes that *hypokouein* is not used while *hypotassestho* is used. The former often refers to "free obedience" while the latter stresses the rule of the divine order with its levels of "super- and sub-ordination."⁷⁷

⁷⁶ William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, International Critical Commentary, vol. 31 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), 366.

⁷⁷ Ernst Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980) 351 refers to G. Delling, Romer 13, 1-7 innerhalb der Briefe des NT (1963), 39ff.

Cf. Gerhard Friedrich, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. VIII (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972), 36.

Many have noted the frequency of cognate words. The root "tasso" is the base for: tetagmenai, antitassomenos, and diatage, as well as hypotassestho. And so the idea of "order" is emphasized in this passage. The term hypotassestho appears seventeen times in the Pauline writings outside this passage. Only one other time, in Titus 3:1, does it refer to rulers. All other references are either to God, his law, or his righteousness (Rom 8:7,20, Rom 10:3 1Cor 15:27-28) or to Jesus (Eph 1:22, Phil 3:21) or to those within the church (1Cor 14:32,34, 1Cor 16:16, Eph 5:21) or to those within households (wives to husbands Col 3:18, Tit 2:5 and slaves to masters Tit 2:9) The idea of one being in a position of authority over another is noted. Yet, hypotassestho is in the middle voice indicating that one would subject oneself. So there is also the idea of freedom, the idea of the individual being in control. Still the middle voice may indicate that Paul is asking a person to place themselves in a position under the authorities by their thoughts and actions. The evidence indicates that levels of "super-" and "sub-ordination" are intended. Later in this passage, Paul did specify what was involved in this subjection.

Paul specifically laid before them the subjection to which he refers in verse seven, "Pay to all what is due them, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor

is due." "Apodote" has the idea of "giving back",⁷⁸ and opheilas has the idea of "owing."⁷⁹ So there is a strong sense of an obligation or duty which the Roman Christians owe to the authorities. The idea of individual duty is again established. "Phoros" is the "tax on the person or on lands" while "telos" or "custom" is "what is levied on merchandise."⁸⁰ "Phobos" is "respectful awe which is felt for one who has power in his hands" while "timen" is honour and reverence paid to a ruler.⁸¹ These are things which are necessary for maintaining the order as the authorities carry out their duties. They include both ones attitude toward the authorities (honor and respect) as well as ones actions (paying taxes and custom). The question then arises as to the identity of these authorities.

The discussion in the review of the literature has

⁷⁸ W. Robert Cook, "Biblical Light on the Christian's Civic Responsibility," Bibliotheca Sacra 127 (Ja-Mr 1970) 55.

⁷⁹ J. Gersham Machen, New Testament Greek for Beginners (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1923), 264.

⁸⁰ Editorial note from John Calvin, Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans trans. and ed. by John Owen (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947), 483.

⁸¹ Sanday and Headlam, op. cit. p. 368.

shown the need to go beyond the passage and the context to get a dual meaning for the word echousia.⁸² The arguments for the dual reference of echousia are rather tenuous. In regard to the Pauline usage of the word, there is no agreement among the scholars that Paul had intended a dual reference for any of the usages of echousia let alone the passage in question. Although the cultural milieu supported this view, it is an assumption with little Biblical evidence to say that Paul's usage of this term was the same. The Biblical context strongly favors the view that only earthly authorities are intended. Whether the term has a dualistic meaning or not, it should be noted that the authorities are still those who are of the "sons of disobedience" who like demonic beings would not have the interests of Christ in mind. It is one thing to be subject to God or to other believers, but it is quite another for one to told to be subject to any who are non-believers. Yet as it has been shown, subjection does not mean complete obedience.

Cranfield noted that the qualifying word uperechousias

⁸² Refer to the review of the literature, page 3ff.

does not refer to one, but to many in this context.⁸³ It could mean authorities in the upper ranks, but it more likely refers to those in positions over the ones to whom the letter is written.⁸⁴ Others agree that this term does not refer to the state in the abstract sense, "but with persons who have something definite to do, who occupy a definite position, and expect something definite from them."⁸⁵ Having to pay taxes, customs, honor and respect implies that they would have had face-to-face contact with them. This coincides nicely with the structure as noted in the second chapter of this paper. The authorities as well as the other groups of persons mentioned in Romans 12, the

⁸³ C.E.B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, vol. 31 of International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975) p. 659 stated that these are not the uppermost officials of the Roman Empire "but such as excel other men" or "magistrates." Cf. Calvin, op. cit. p. 478.

⁸⁴ C.E.B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, vol. 31 of International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975): 660.

⁸⁵ Emil Brunner, The Letter to the Romans, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959) 110.

Also, cf. Käsemann, op. cit. p.354.

church members and those considered enemies, are the ones whom they see in their "everyday" life of the secular community. Paul throughout Romans 12 and 13 exhorted the Roman Christians to right relationships with all of those with whom they have contact. In verse nine of chapter 13 Paul brought the second greatest commandment to mind as he told his readers to love their neighbor.⁸⁶ Again the idea of the one with whom they have daily contact is brought forth. In the summary of this segment, Paul, in verse thirteen, exhorted his readers to conduct themselves becomingly. "Conduct" is concerned with outward behavior, that which is seen by all with whom they interact on a daily basis. If this is the case, as it seems to be, then Paul does speak of that present situation and has de facto government in mind. Yet, more specifically, it speaks of those in direct authority over them in the affairs of everyday life.

Paul does not stop with the command to be subject to those officials with whom the Christians have daily contact. He proceeds to provide a basis for this call to subjection.

⁸⁶ Dr. David Bauer, Matthew E.B. class, October 1989, referred to the "neighbor" as the one who is "near".

(1b-2b)"for there is no authority except from God, and those authorities that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore whoever resists authority resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment."

This is the first reason that Paul gave the Roman Christians to be in subjection to the authorities. Here Paul spoke of the source of authority.

The word translated "instituted" above has as its root the word *tasso*. Yoder stated that this should be understood in the sense that God "orders" and not "ordains" the authorities.⁸⁷ According to Webster's Dictionary, "ordain" means "to invest officially . . . with ministerial or priestly authority" while "order" means "to put in order" or more specifically "order . . . (means) to put persons or things into their proper places in relation to each other."⁸⁸ The latter definition is to be preferred. It has been noted earlier in the discussion on subjection and authorities that each involves the placing of one in position over another.

⁸⁷ John Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 203.

⁸⁸ "Order" and "Ordain," Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary.

Since authority is from God (13:1) and "whoever resists authority resists what God has appointed"(13:2a), it is a logical consequence to say that the one who resists the authorities, resists God. Although 2b, "those who resist will incur judgment" is connected with a coordinating conjunction this is actually a result of 13:2a. The judgment of God was assumed by Paul.⁸⁹

There are three possibilities here concerning judgment: It could refer to judgment here and now via human agents or to eternal judgment or to both. "Anthestekotes" seems to be in the consummative perfect which would indicate an action done in the past is emphasized while still having present results. Thus the person is still in the state of being opposed to the authorities, having resisted them in the past. "Lempsontai" indicates a future punishment. To say that this means eternal judgment would indicate that this is the unforgivable sin. It would seem that Paul would have chosen the present tense to indicate continuing opposition if he had meant eternal condemnation. More likely, this is the judgment of God, meted out through earthly means as a consequence of sin. This is further substantiated by the reference to the use of the sword by those in authority who are God's servants to execute wrath.

⁸⁹ Robert H. Stein, "The Argument of Romans 13:1-7," Novum Testamentum 31, 4 (1989), 330.

But here, the emphasis is on God's judgment and not the authorities as his means as it is God's authority that is opposed.

As it was indicated previously, this substantiation is again repeated in a summarized form in verse 5 in the phrase, "because of conscience." Seeing that this is so would eliminate those interpretations which would view this as a way for a Christian to limit their subjection to the authorities.⁹⁰ The Roman Christians now would have had the knowledge of how the authorities had derived their position of power. This is another aspect of renewing their minds.(12:2) From what Paul has just conveyed to them, they knew that if they resisted the authorities, they were, in fact, resisting God. Paul's purpose was to encourage submission not to delineate the limits of that submission.

This idea that rulers derived their position from God is not new to those of Jewish origin. The decree from God to Nebuchadnezzar is repeated thrice in Daniel 4 "that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of mortals; he gives it to whom he will. . . ."(Dan 4:17,25,32) This same idea surfaces in the gospels when Jesus tells Pilate that

⁹⁰ This is not to imply that one's conscience should not be employed to judge the limits of subjection. Rather it is to note that that is not how Paul is using the word in this context.

his power was given to him by God. (John 19:10-11) The Romans Christians, however, seemed to need a reminder of this as a basis for subjecting themselves to authorities. Paul continued with another reason for being subject.

(3a-4d) "For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Do you wish to have no fear of the authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval; for it is God's servant for your good. But if you do what is wrong, you should be afraid, for the authority does not bear the sword in vain! It is the servant of God to execute wrath on the wrongdoer."

Here we find the second reason to be subject. In the first substantiation Paul spoke of the source of the position of authority as ordered by God. Here he has spoken of the function of that position.

"Rulers" are used synonymously with authorities.

Paul spoke of two contrasting functions which are contingent upon the actions of those in subjection. In both cases, Paul referred to their actions as being the will of God when he referred to them as God's servants. "Servant of God" would be taken in its secular sense as

"civil servants and officials."⁹¹ Watson notes that officials are not only in authority but also under authority.⁹² That they are here said to be servants of God does not necessarily mean that they are ones who desire to obey God.⁹³ The Old Testament gives various cases of those who are said to be servants of God but yet they do not acknowledge God. (Assyria Isa 10:5-13ff, Cyrus Isa. 44:28, Nebuchadnezzar Jer. 25:9, 27:6, 43:10)

The substantiation of 3a, "For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad," begins with a question. The question posed here is really an apodosis. If you would have no fear -- then do what is good.⁹⁴ This good is related to the previous -- good works. Concerning "good work" (and "evil work"), Culver sees the use of the Greek article as indicative of "a class of things - good works as

⁹¹ Käsemann, Commentary 356.

Also, cf. Strathmann, TDNT, iv, 231.

⁹² Philip S. Watson, The State as a Servant of God, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946), 25.

⁹³ Eller op. cit. p. 9.

⁹⁴ Stein op. cit. p. 333 refers to F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, (Chicago: Chicago University, 1961) 247 n. 471 (3).

a class, evil works as a class."⁹⁵ The same usage of the article before *agathov* is noted in 12:2,9,21, and in 13:4 as well as appearing twice in 13:3. It is contrasted with *kakon* in verse 13:4 as well as 12:21. Doing what is good is synonymous with good conduct -- both found in verse three and contrasted with doing wrong and "wrongdoer" in verse four. In the immediate context one notes that in 13:10 evil works, *kakon ouk ergazetai*, are discouraged. In 13:12 casting off works of darkness is mentioned. The emphasis on conduct which ties this pericope to its context is again seen. Here the bad conduct would be related specifically to those who are not under subjection to the authorities and by their actions show their insubordination. But, apparently some did pay taxes as noted in verse six. This brings up the possibility that Christ's words about the tax for Caesar were probably known in the early church and were followed.⁹⁶ Yet he goes on in verse seven to state, "pay to all what is due them. . . ." The extent of their subjection was far too limited and they were yet not giving what they owed the authorities. In doing that which is evil, they brought the wrath of God

⁹⁵ Robert Duncan Culver, Toward a Biblical View of Civil Government, (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1974), 252.

⁹⁶ Sanday and Headlam, *op. cit.* p.368.

by means of the authorities upon themselves. The possible extent of that punishment seems to be evident in the clause. In reference to the use of the term translated "sword." James quotes John Murray to say that "a symbol is valid only so far as it accurately represents the reality it is intended to symbolize. 'To suppose that the word. . . can be restricted to lesser forms of punitive infliction and does not imply the extreme penalty is to go in the face of that which "the sword" properly and obviously symbolizes.'"⁹⁷ But if their conduct is good, if they are in subjection, there is honor from the officials.⁹⁸

This goodness and evil would then not be moral goodness or evil as such, but would relate to their political relationships.

This action on the part of the authorities implies that all have knowledge of good and evil (within limits).

In the phrase "for your good", "good" here is used in another sense than what has just been encountered. In this verse Paul seemed to be addressing the members of the Romans church as individuals as he used the second person

⁹⁷ Stephen A. James, "Divine Justice and the Retributive Duty of Civil Government," Trinity Journal 6, no. 2 (Aut 1985): 206.

⁹⁸ Käsemann, op. cit. 358.

singular throughout. That it does not deal with salvation seems evident in the contrast with the latter portion of the verse "it is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrongdoer." This may be a rather limited view of what is here intended. The call to subjection is addressed to the individual. The particularization of that subjection in verse seven would also be intended for the individual. In verse seven, as was noted earlier, there is the idea of giving back to or owing the authorities. And so one can deduce that there is something which has been given to the "subjects" in the first place. For the context one notes that approval is given but also that the evildoers are punished. This latter function would be to the benefit of the individual as it limits wrongdoing in the social sphere. A further thought would be that those individuals who are not Christians would only be limited in anti-social behavior by fear of punishment having not had the perspective of an informed Christian. This contrast suggests a positive response of an authority to those who do good works as contrasted to evil works. Paul, however, was concerned primarily with those who would not fit this category. There seemed to be more of a concern among the Christians that they would be recipients of the "wrath." That this is God's wrath that is executed on the wrongdoer is again noted in the phrase of the chiastic summary of verse five: "not only because of wrath." The use of the

adverb "only" followed by a purpose clause suggests that the primary motivation to subjection had been the avoidance of punishment. Whether the Christians had understood this action on the part of the authorities as the execution of God's wrath is doubtful. Verse four is written to clarify this relationship to the readers.

Paul's primary concern was that the Roman Christians be subject. This analysis of these verses strongly point to some type of "persecution." At least that is probably how the Roman Christians saw it or they would most likely not have been involved in activity that brought the wrath of the authorities upon some of them. The "wrath" which is seen as their only previous motivation to be subject, Paul's command to be subject as well as the indication that only taxes were paid (though possibly not all of them; and respect and honor were probably not given at all) all point to a lack of subjection with its consequences.

Paul seemed to be walking a tightrope here -- condemning certain behavior yet wanting to be accepted by those he soon hoped to visit and among whom he hoped to minister.

He taught that those governing functionaries with whom they must deal on a daily basis were accountable to God from whom they derive their authority. They were also responsible to him to affirm the good and punish the evil

as they act as instruments of God's wrath. Paul showed that this affirmation or retribution, whatever the case may be was a result of the subject's actions. Having been so informed Paul reiterated his call to subjection and in the particularization showed then a change in attitude as well as action is required. Similarly, Paul showed that the Roman Christians were responsible, and accountable to God to give what is due.

Viewing this pericope in this way, one can see much closer ties to this context. The admonitions prior to this pericope apply to Christians in relation to those governing authorities such as: bless them (12:14), live peaceably with them (12:18), feed them if necessary (12:20), return good for evil (12:21). Also, and most importantly, is the familiar command to love them -- probably the most difficult admonition of all for these Roman Christians to obey.

The implications of these findings along with a view of the historical and social setting as well as the text as a whole will be discussed in the closing chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

Summary and Implications

Much of what has been written concerning this passage has emphasized the "state." Paul did make significant statements concerning the state,⁹⁹ but as it has been shown, his purpose was not to give a theory or expound a Christian doctrine of the state. His purpose was paraenetic. The key concept is not "authorities" or "wrath", but rather "subjection."

In this concluding chapter the findings of the previous chapter in the light of the historical and social setting as well as the text will be considered. Secondly, it would be helpful to explore what this passage is not conveying though it may have been used to support such

⁹⁹ "State" as used in its modern sense will denote the more democratic forms of government, unless otherwise specified.

certain positions in the past and may continue to be so used. Lastly, the implications for today which can be derived from this passage will be explored.

From the analysis it seems that Paul was not unaware of the circumstances of the Roman Christians. He had not met them, but that does not mean he was unaware of their situation. He was quite likely in Corinth which was close to Rome in comparison to other places to which he had previously travelled. There is a strong possibility that he wrote to them at a time near to their return to Rome after having been expelled in 49 A.D. And so he could have been well informed of the political situation. It is well known that there were zealot factions among the Jews in those days. It seems quite likely that some Christians were influenced by Jewish nationalism. If they had just returned to Rome, they may have needed to be extra careful with their political relationships.

It was not the government that Paul sought to change. Paul saw that what he needed to address was the lack of subjection of the Roman Christians to the authorities. Although this passage does not refer in any way to persecution, the context of this passage in the immediate segment and in the book as a whole gives the suggestion that this may have been a possibility. It is evident that there was wrongdoing on the part of the Roman Christians in

not being subject to the authorities. As was mentioned in the summary of the preceding chapter it may have appeared to the Roman Christians that they were being persecuted when, in fact, they were being punished. There also could have been persecution. The fact that Paul mentioned persecution in the paragraph just preceding Romans 13 may hint that this was a problem with the state. It does speak of what one should think or do if he or she is persecuted. Again the source of that persecution is unclear. Yet Paul put suffering in perspective as he states in 8:18 "I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory about to be revealed to us." Later in this same chapter Paul told the Christians that they are more than conquerors through Christ when faced with persecution or peril or the sword, etc. (8:36-37) Specifically he told them to bless those who persecute them (12:14), not to return evil with evil (12:17) and to overcome evil with good (12:21). Paul's exhortation to be subject also would have had the effect of promoting peace. Obedience to Paul on this issues would promote peace with the authorities. He had just advocated peace in 12:18: "If it be possible, so far as it depends on you, live peaceably with all." This theme is also mentioned in Paul's letter to Timothy in which he urged that prayer be made for those in high places for the purpose of leading "a quiet and peaceable life with all godliness and dignity." (1 Tim

2:1-2)

The fact that Paul wrote to Christians at the capital of the empire is significant. Their faith was being proclaimed throughout the world. (Rom 1:8) What a testimony! Yet word of their insubordination would also be spread into the Roman world also. And so Paul called for a change in their attitude and behavior.

These ideas of submission were not necessarily new to those who had been Jews. So one might ask what the significance of the Christian view might be. Their conduct was a result of the transformation of a mind that was focused on God. What this passage definitely seems to say is that the Christian's life in Christ was not limited to certain familial or social relationships, but it encompassed all areas of their life. Obeying the commands of Paul would have altered their thoughts and actions which would have resulted in the favor of those officials with whom they had to do. Yet this would not have been the primary motive. Their motives would have been broader and deeper. Their actions would have been one aspect of the outworking of the transformed life, motivated by God's rich mercy toward them. (Rom 12:1-2) This new life was to transform all relationships of their lives in their totality. It was to be a part of their daily living sacrifice, their daily worship to God. Overcoming evil with good and loving their neighbor mentioned before and

after this pericope respectively, does not exclude persons that happen to work for the government.

What a contrast these Christians would have been in the midst of the Jews! The Christian hope did not rest on overthrowing the present government to establish an Christian kingdom on earth. Rather their hope was in the kingdom of God that already dwelt in their midst, the rule of Christ in their hearts!

Through the ages this passage has been used to support many causes. However, this passage is rather limited in what it has to say about the state for several reasons. First, as it was noted above, Paul's purpose was paraenetic; his purpose was to exhort the Roman Christians to be subject. Secondly, the government at that time was rather unlike our modern democracies wherein the people govern themselves. Paul did not speak as if the government was oppressive. Few, if any of the Christians were citizens. As it was they were few in number. So their political influence was practically nil. Lastly, what Paul had to say about the function of the authorities was rather limited. He seemed to speak primarily of just those authorities who had direct contact with the Roman Christians.

So, it does not give a theory or doctrine of the state.

Paul did not address in this passage what one is to do if the authorities would become oppressive and punish those who are "good."

It does not give a basis for civil disobedience against policies of government with which one disagrees.¹⁰⁰

The use of the word "conscience" in 13:5 does not imply that this is the reason that one would have for limiting their obedience to the state. (Again, in this passage it is the reason why one should be subject.) In other ways this passage does not give a limit to the injustice that should be endured.

The use of the word "sword" does not refer to war.

This passage does not address whether or not one should hold an office or in other ways be employed by the

¹⁰⁰ Acts 5:29 mentioned earlier, is a New Testament example of disobedience, but this was disobedience to the religious leaders. However, 2 Cor 11:32-33 mentions that Paul fled when the governor sought to capture him. Old Testament examples of civil disobedience include: the Egyptian midwives who defied Pharaoh when they did not kill the Hebrew babies (Exo 1:15-2:2), Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego who did not bow to a statue thereby defying the king's order, (Dan 3) and Daniel who prayed to God thereby defying the order of the king.(Dan 6)

government.

It is not addressing an attempt to change the government.

There is much which can be said for a Christian of today regarding their relationship with the authorities. From the analysis it is seen that this passage speaks of de facto government. Yet in the analysis of the source and function of the government it seems that this passage speaks of de jure government to an extent. That all governments obtain their source of power from God and that their proper function is for the good and against evil in society seems to be universally true.

For Christians today taxes, customs, respect, and honor would be the least that would be owed to the state. To give to the state that which is necessary to maintain the order would also require participation in the affairs of the state since this government relies on the participation of its citizens to decide issues and place persons in office. Little more can be said that would be derived from this passage regarding that which one today should give to the state.

It is clear from the passage that one derives some benefit from the state. In promoting the good and restraining the evil, the government upholds order and

peace in society. By supporting the government by giving revenue and respect, Christians are also upholding order and peace in society.

This passage highly suggest that a Christian understand the authority and function of the government as from God. It would then follow that the wrath meted out by authorities against evil is understood to be part of God's vengeance against evil. These actions by the government toward good or against evil are understood to be a consequence of that which a person does. Also a Christian who is so informed about the source and function of the authorities would be going against their conscience to disobey them. This would mean that they would be resisting God. Yet it is understood as stated by Stevick that "Do not be conformed to this world" does no equal "unquestioning assent to the state."¹⁰¹

A Christian's attitude and actions toward those officials with whom they have daily contact is also to be transformed as they live their new life in Christ. This can only be understood in the totality of the Christian life. One who knows that he is justified to God through Christ is motivated by His great mercy and enabled through

¹⁰¹ Daniel B. Stevick, Civil Disobedience and the Christian, (New York: The Seabury Press, 1969), 26.

the gift of Christ to live a life that is pleasing to him. On the other hand are those who are without Christ, without understanding of this way of life. A Christian is reminded that for many of them the only motivation to obey the authorities is the fear of punishment. The church is dependent on society as "the work of redemption, even the proclamation of Christ, cannot be defined in terms of the Church alone, but only in terms of the Church and the State."¹⁰² It is well known that the state cannot legislate morality, it cannot change human hearts -- only God through Christ can do this work. This paraenesis placed as it is under the rubric of the transformed life demonstrates that the involvement in government is secondary to God's greater purposes for us.

The Christian witness in this area of his life and in all areas of his life help to bring about the "obedience of faith among all the Gentiles for the sake of (Jesus') name." (Rom 1:5, 16:26)

¹⁰² Clinton Morrison, The Powers That Be, Napierville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960) 126-27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barth, Karl. Church and State, trans. by G. Ronald Howe.
London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1939.

Bauer, David. Class notes on Matthew E.B. delivered
October 1989.

Borg, Marcus. "A New Context for Romans XIII." New
Testament Studies 19 (Oct 1972-73): 205-218.

Bornkamm, Günther. Paul. trans. by D.M.G. Stalker. New
York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1971.

Brunner, Emil. The Letter to the Romans. Philadelphia:
The Westminster Press, 1959.

Calvin, John. Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the
Apostle to the Romans. trans. and ed. by John Owen.
Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.,
1947.

Carey, George L. "Biblical-Theological Perspectives on War and Peace." The Evangelical Quarterly 57 (April 1985): 163-78.

Cook, W. Robert. "Biblical Light on the Christian's Civic Responsibility." Bibliotheca Sacra 127 (Ja-Mr 1970): 44-47.

Cranfield, C.E.B. A Commentary on Romans 12-13. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, no. 12. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

---. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. vol. 31 of the International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975.

Culver, Robert Duncan. Toward a Biblical View of Civil Government. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1974.

Cullmann, Oscar. The State in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

Dahl, N.A. "Is There a New Testament Basis for the Doctrine of the Two Kingdoms?" Lutheran World 12 No. 4 (1965) 337-54.

Dodd, C. H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffat New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932? (Possibly as late as 1941.)

Dodd, C. H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The Moffat New Testament Commentary. London: Collins Clear-Type Press, 1959.

Dyck, Harold J. "The Christian and the Authorities in Romans 13:1-7." Direction. 14 No. 1, (Spring 1985): 44-50.

Eller, Vernard. "Romans 13 (actually Romans 12:14-13:8) Reexamined." Theological Students Fellowship 10 (Ja-F 1987) 7-10.

Garrett, James L., ed. "Dialectic of Romans 13:1-7 and Revelation 13: Part One." Journal of Church and State 18 (Aut 76) 433-42.

Holmberg, Bengt. Sociology and the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.

Hultgren, Arland J. "Reflections on Romans 13:1-7 Submission to Governing Authorities." Dialog. 15 (Aut 76): 263-69.

James, Stephen A. "Divine Justice and the Retributive Duty of Civil Government." Trinity Journal 6 no. 2 (Aut 1985): 199-210.

Kallas, James. "Romans XIII. 1-7: An Interpolation." New Testament Studies 11 (Oct 64 - July 65): 365-74.

Käsemann, Ernst. Commentary on Romans, trans. and ed. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.

---. New Testament Questions of Today. trans. by W.J. Montague. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Leenhardt, Franz J. The Epistle to the Romans. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.

Lehmann, Paul. The Transfiguration of Politics. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Machen, J. Gersham. New Testament Greek for Beginners. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1923.

McDonald, J.I.H. "Romans 13.1-7: A Test Case for New Testament Interpretation." New Testament Studies 35 (1989) 540-49.

---. "Romans 13,1-7 and Christian Social Ethics Today." Modern Churchman. 29,2 (1987): 19-25.

Meeks, Wayne A. The First Urban Christian. Binghamton, New York: Yale University Press, 1983.

Morrison, Clinton. The Powers That Be. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960.

Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans, trans. by Carl C. Rasmussen. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.

"Order and Ordain." Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary.

O'Neill, John Cochrane. Paul's Letter to the Romans. Baltimore: Penguin Books Inc., 1975.

Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. vol. 31 of The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Stein, Robert H. "The Argument of Romans 13:1-7." Novum Testamentum 31, 4 (1989): 325-343.

Stevick, Daniel B. Civil Disobedience and the Christian.
New York: The Seabury Press, 1969.

Stringfellow, William. Conscience and Obedience. Waco,
Texas: Word Books, 1971.

Tripp, David. An Interpretation on Rom 13:1-7 in Light of
Sapiential and Apocalyptic Traditions Diss SW Baptist
Theological Seminary 1987.

Watson, Philip S. The State as a Servant of God. London:
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1946.

Webster, Alexander F.C. "St. Paul's Political Advice to
the Haughty Gentile Christians in Rome: An Exegesis of
Romans 13:1-7." Saint Vladimir's Theological
Quarterly 25 no. 4, (1981), 259-82.

Witmer, John A. Review of When is it Right to Right?, by
Robert A. Morey. Bibliotheca Sacra (April-June 1987):
228.

Wood, James C., Jr., and E. Bruce Thompson, and Robert T. Miller. Church and State in Scripture History and Constitutional Law. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1958.

Yoder, John. The Politics of Jesus. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1972.